

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claim 1-4, 12-15, 28, 30, 32-34, 39, and 43 are amended without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 12-15, 28-37, 39, and 41-43 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 12-15, 28-37, 39, and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 12-15, 28-37, 39, and 41-43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 12-15, 28-37, 39, and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Galler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,720) (“Galler et al.”) in view of Kanevsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,616) (“Kanevsky et al.”). Claim 1 is amended to recite that the first user speech input comprises at least one non-alphanumeric character. The specification provides support for this amendment at paragraphs [0019] and [0023], which state “The term “identifier” refers to any arrangement of letters, numbers, or other typographical characters, regardless of whether such an arrangement comprises an actual word or a non-word.” Some non-limiting examples of non-alphanumeric characters include “@”, “.”, “*”, and “-”. By including such non-typographical characters, a user can provide an email address (which includes non-alphanumeric characters) as speech input, for example, instead of being limited to a strictly alphanumeric username. Neither Galler et al. nor Kanevsky et al. disclose or suggest this limitation.

For example, Galler et al. teach one embodiment designed to recognize continuously spelled names comprising a sequence of letters. Galler et al., col. 5, lines 64-67. The following

sequence of letters is one example of this: “H-A-N-S-O-N”. Galler et al., col. 6, lines 1-9. Further, Galler et al. teach that the speech recognizer identifies each of the letters uttered and looks up the spelled names by alignment of the sequence of letters with the dictionary. Galler et al., col. 2, lines 14-19. In other words, Galler et al. relies on a dictionary of acceptable letter sequences such as words or recognized surnames. The principles and design of Galler et al. suggest away from using non-alphanumeric characters because such typographical characters are not found in a dictionary of acceptable letter sequences. Galler et al. suggest as much when they disclose that the invention splits the acoustic speech data into two or more paths that are each handled differently. One path is processed using a first grammar network based on the assumption that only useful utterances (e.g., letters) are supplied. Another path is processed using a different grammar network that assumes extraneous, nonuseful speech precedes the useful speech. The different grammar networks thus result in different segmentation of the data. Galler et al., col. 2, lines 57-65. The acoustic speech data is split into two portions: letters and other speech that is assumed to be “extraneous, nonuseful speech.”

Galler et al. go on to teach that if extraneous speech is present, the grammar network identifies and rejects the extraneous speech. Galler et al., col. 3, lines 26-32. Inasmuch as Galler et al. would consider the non-alphanumeric characters recited in claim 1 as nonuseful speech and consequently reject them, Galler et al. simultaneously fail to disclose or suggest this limitation and teach directly away from this limitation.


For these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over the cited references. Claims 12 and 32 have been amended to recite similar limitations to those found in claim 1. Therefore, claims 12 and 32 and their dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references. For at least these reasons, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP, Account No. 14-1437 for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 6, 2010

By:  _____

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 83224

Thomas M. Isaacson
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433